

MAYOR AND CABINET		
Report Title	REDEVELOPMENT OF FOREST HILL POOLS – INITIAL DESIGN AND FEASIBILITY WORK AND RESULTS OF COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND CONSULTATION	
Key Decision	Yes	Item No. 11
Ward	Forest Hill	
Contributors	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR FOR REGENERATION/EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR FOR RESOURCES/EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR FOR COMMUNITY SERVICES	
Class	Part 1	Date: 17 September 2008

1. Purpose of report

- 1.1 To inform the Mayor of the initial design and feasibility work undertaken with respect to the redevelopment of Forest Hill Pools detailed in part 5 of this report; to inform the Mayor of the results of the community engagement and consultation detailed in part 6 of this report; to inform the Mayor of the listing of Louise House and its implications detailed in part 7 of this report; and to seek the Mayor's approval to proceed with the proposed approach set out in part 8 of this report.

2. Policy context

- 2.1 Lewisham's Physical Activity, Sport and Leisure Strategy 2006-2011 sets out the vision of "Creating life changes through an active and healthy Lewisham". Its three key aims are to increase participation in physical activity and sport, enable Lewisham's community to develop its potential in sport and leisure, and to develop an appropriate infrastructure of facilities. Swimming is a key part of this strategy. It is a form of physical activity that most people can undertake, and is one of the most popular sporting activities in the Borough.
- 2.2 Lewisham's Sustainable Community Strategy 2008 - 2020 sets out one of the borough's priorities as 'Healthy, active and enjoyable - where people can actively participate in maintaining and improving their health and well-being'. Contributing aims to this priority include 'Improve the well-being of our citizens by increasing participation in healthy and active lifestyles', and 'Improve health outcomes and tackle the specific conditions that affect our citizens'.
- 2.3 The Council's ten strategic priorities include 'clean, green and liveable - where people live in high quality housing and can care for and enjoy their environment'. A contributing aim to this priority is to 'increase the

supply and quality of housing to accommodate the diverse needs of our population'.

- 2.4 "Game Plan" – the Government's strategy for delivering sport and physical activity objectives, and - "Choosing Health" – the Government's white paper, both highlight the role physical activity and sport play in developing a healthier lifestyle.
- 2.5 The Forest Hill Urban Design Framework and Development Strategy were adopted by the Council in 2003. The Framework sets out supplementary planning guidance on the treatment of the Library and Pools complex to give an enhanced community focus to the site and allows for a redevelopment option.
- 2.6 "People, Prosperity, Place: Lewisham Regeneration Strategy 2008 – 2020" includes the commitment, under the People theme, to healthy communities : to reduce health inequalities and encourage healthy lifestyles.

3. **Recommendations**

The Mayor is recommended to:

- 3.1 note the initial design and feasibility work including options analyses undertaken in part 5 of this report and the results of the community engagement and consultation undertaken in Part 6 of this report;
- 3.2 note and consider the results of the statutory consultation with secure tenants undertaken in accordance with S105 of the Housing Act 1985 in Appendix A of this report;
- 3.3 having considered the results of the Section 105 consultation referred to at recommendation 3.2, agree in principle to the inclusion of the housing amenity land within the redevelopment (shown hatched on the plan at Appendix B), subject to a further report detailing the exact extent of the land required once the final design scheme has been developed;
- 3.4 instruct officers to commission further feasibility work in the light of the recent listing of Louise House to determine the options and cost implications for delivering a two pool leisure centre and retaining Louise House, and report the results to Mayor & Cabinet in early 2009.

4. **Background**

- 4.1 In 2002 the Council's Sport and Leisure Service received a good two star inspection rating from the Audit Commission. A key recommendation from the inspection was that a comprehensive audit of facility provision be undertaken to address current and predicted future need.

- 4.2 Capita Consulting were appointed in 2004 to undertake the audit. In December 2004 the "Leisure Investment Strategy Review" report was published which detailed the outcomes of the audit.
- 4.3 The "Leisure Investment Strategy Review" report recommended a four pool pattern (Wavelengths, Lewisham Centre, The Bridge and Downham) as the required minimum to provide residents and schools with reasonable access to a local pool. Notwithstanding this report the Mayor recognised the support in the local community for the retention of wet leisure facilities in Forest Hill and in 2005 the Mayor requested officers undertake a facility options study to encompass refurbishment of the existing facility and new build alternatives, and canvass local opinion through a consultation process with respect to the same.
- 4.4 In February 2006 the Mayor concluded that the consultation process had not produced a clear preference for either a new facility or refurbishment of the existing facility. A high level cost analysis provided by Capita Symonds showed a potential refurbishment of the existing facility to be 30% cheaper than a new build facility. As a consequence on the 22nd February 2006 the Mayor made an in principle decision in favour of the refurbishment option conditional upon officers undertaking a detailed feasibility and risk assessment of the refurbishment option.
- 4.5 In February 2006 and March 2006 the Activity Pool and the Main Pool were respectively closed due to health and safety concerns in relation to the structure of the existing facility. In August 2006 English Heritage wrote to confirm that they would not be listing the existing facility in response to an application for listing received in early 2006. This was the second time that English Heritage had received an application to list the existing pools facility and the second refusal to list.
- 4.6 The detailed feasibility study and risk assessment of the refurbishment option commenced in late summer 2006 with an initial intrusive survey of the pool tanks, and a report was received in November 2006. The estimated costs of the refurbishment were increased by 20% as a consequence of this initial report. In July 2007 the Council's Programme Management team were able to fully engage with and undertake the detailed feasibility and risk assessment and the outcome of this work was reported to Mayor and Cabinet on the 13th February 2008.
- 4.7 The report detailed in 4.6 above recommended that the Mayor reconsider the refurbishment option because the proposed refurbishment carried an unacceptably high level of risk in relation to successful delivery, and the potential costs of the refurbishment carried too high a level of uncertainty. Of particular concern was the condition and structural integrity of the Pool Tank and Pool Walls which were subject to severe cracking and were not capable of being repaired with any certainty. Consequently, the Council's Director of Programme Management & Property undertook a high level options appraisal of new build options for Mayor and Cabinet to consider. Of these

alternatives option number 3 was considered the optimum, which involved the redevelopment of the whole site to include the demolition of the existing pools and Louise House buildings, and to include the adjoining pocket park as part of the redevelopment. This option also included the potential to include new housing to generate a land receipt that could provide subsidy and additional funding for the new leisure facility.

- 4.8 On February 13th 2008 Mayor and Cabinet reconsidered the option to refurbish the existing facility and abandoned the proposed refurbishment in favour of a new build solution. Officers were authorised to undertake initial design and feasibility work in relation to option 3 with a budget of £100,000 (from the gross project budget), and to engage and consult the local community on the new proposals.
- 4.9 In April 2008 English Heritage wrote to the Council stating that they had received an application to list Louise House and that they would be making a formal assessment. The results of this assessment are detailed in section 7.

5. Initial design and feasibility work – options analyses

- 5.1 In April 2008 officers appointed HLM architects to work with them and undertake the initial design and feasibility work in relation to Option 3. HLM were chosen because of their substantial experience of working on public sector projects, major regeneration schemes, and private sector residential and retail schemes. As such they were ideally positioned to advise and work with the programme management team on Option 3 as a mixed use, cross subsidy scheme with both public and private sector elements. The initial commission was to develop designs to RIBA stage C.
- 5.2 The objectives of the design process were as follows:-
- to develop a baseline leisure facility design that is:
 - based on a rigorous urban design analysis that capitalises on the strengths of the site
 - sympathetic to and does not overshadow the adjacent listed Library building
 - compliant with planning guidance for the Forest Hill area;
 - to develop three options providing varying levels of residential housing on the site and investigate the opportunity for retail use on the site, demonstrating the additional leisure facilities that can be delivered as a consequence of cross subsidy from the land receipt for the housing;
 - to re-provide the green space of the current pocket park that adjoins the existing pool buildings in an attractive manner;
 - to enable feedback from and consultation with the community on the baseline design and three development options, and in particular to obtain feedback and views on the balance between the level of housing development and the level of leisure facility provision.

- 5.3 HLM Architects provided Council officers with a written feasibility report of the work that had been undertaken together with officers in June 2008. The full report can be viewed on the Council's web pages for the Forest Hill Pools redevelopment at: www.lewisham.gov.uk/foresthillpools .
- 5.4 A high level brief summary of the HLM report is as follows:
- The baseline leisure facility design has a new approach and entrance from the town centre along Dartmouth Road. The new Pools façade curves around Dartmouth Road and the simple render of stone and glazing provides both an active frontage along Dartmouth Road and a finish that is sympathetic to the listed Library building. The public realm along Dartmouth Road is enhanced by utilising the green space in front of Kingswear House and Salcombe House as part of the redevelopment. The topography of the site is used to minimise the impact of the redevelopment on neighbours and to celebrate the Library building.
 - The three development options are matched from an affordability perspective so that forecast construction costs approximately match forecast funding receipts (being the £7.5m from the Capital programme for option 1, plus estimated land receipts from Housing for options 2 and 3).
 - Option 1 is the low development option with no residential housing so that the only funding that is available is from the Capital programme. This option can afford a main pool leisure facility configuration only and delivers 2500m² of GIFA (gross internal floor area).
 - Option 2 is the medium development option that provides 28 new homes and 191m² of retail space. The additional subsidy that this provides enables the addition of a learner pool to the facility and increases the space available in the facility to a GIFA of 2800m².
 - Option 3 is the high development option that provides 59 new homes and 191m² of retail space. The additional subsidy that this provides enables the addition of a learner pool to the facility and extensive community space which increases the GIFA to 5700 m².
- 5.5 The commercial approach to the redevelopment scheme subsequent to this phase would partly depend on the option chosen. Whichever option was chosen it was the intention of the programme management team that the design would be developed to RIBA stage E prior to passing the design over to a contractor for build. If the chosen option included residential housing that is separate from the leisure facility then the scheme could remain Council led. If the housing units adjoined the leisure facility so that they became a part of the same building the Council may have needed to work with a development partner to deliver the scheme.
- 5.6 Sustainability will be a key component of any scheme, and the final scheme will be designed to comply with the Part L regulations and to target a very good BREEAM rating (Buildings Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method).

- 5.7 In addition to working with HLM Architects on the new leisure facility design, the programme management team commissioned a historical survey of the existing pools facility and Louise House to determine which elements of the existing buildings on the site were worthy of retention from a historical perspective. This survey was also commissioned in response to the affection for the existing buildings amongst members of the local community. The work was undertaken by Donald Insall Associates and a full copy of the final report can be viewed and downloaded from the Council's website at www.lewisham.gov.uk/foresthillpools .
- 5.8 A brief summary of the historical survey is as follows:
- A number of aspects made the pools building interesting; however by 2008 the most interesting aspects have been lost;
 - The condition of the principal elevation and forecourt landscaping is generally poor and the principal elevation has been inappropriately modified which reduces the historic value of the building;
 - As with the exterior of the building, the pools were not constructed exactly as the architect's original plans; and alterations have been made since, leaving little in the way of architectural or historical interest;
 - The principal elevation of the pool building contributes to the 19th Century character of the street when viewed together with the Louise House façade;
 - The buildings do not stand comparison with other historic buildings in the borough;
 - In view of local interest, consideration might be given to donating some of the laundry/filtration equipment to a museum;
 - In advance of demolition, professional photographs should be commissioned to record the building as it is today;
 - The Council should not be required to incorporate elements of the existing pools into the new design on historic grounds.
- 5.9 In order to validate the options appraisal undertaken by the Council's Director of Programme Management and Property in Part 6 of the Mayor and Cabinet report dated the 13th February 2008, and notwithstanding the Mayors decision to instruct officers to undertake design and feasibility work with respect to Option 3 (which involves the demolition of both the existing pools building and Louise House), the programme management team commissioned a feasibility study from PTE Architects (PTEa) as part of this work phase to determine the commercial attractiveness of the residential conversion of Louise House and the Pools frontage building.
- 5.10 PTEa were chosen to do this work given their substantial experience of residential property development as both architect and developer, including the refurbishment and residential conversion of old buildings. For the purposes of this commission PTEa were instructed to ignore the pools redevelopment and examine solely the residential conversion of the two buildings so that the former would not have an impact on their opinion of the latter. This report was received in June 2008 and

the full report can be viewed and downloaded from the Council's website at www.lewisham.gov.uk/foresthillpools .

- 5.11 A brief high level summary of the report is as follows:
- PTEa followed relevant planning guidance in preparing the proposals. A visual non intrusive survey was undertaken and sketch proposals and drawings produced to illustrate the conversions. Estimated valuations were prepared and a cost consultant specialising in this type of work produced elemental cost plans. These cost plans were verified by Press and Starkey the Employers Agent for the Pools redevelopment.
 - The development appraisals indicated that the commercial viability of the conversion is marginal with the Pools frontage building being more attractive than Louise House
 - At a developer margin of 10% the buildings could generate a capital receipt of £400k. However, there would be a high degree of uncertainty around this receipt because a developer would normally operate on a 20% margin, and on this basis the buildings would generate a negligible land receipt. In addition the refurbishment costs were considered uncertain and might increase if a full intrusive survey of Louise House was undertaken. Furthermore the slump in the property market is likely to have reduced the attractiveness of this proposition to any developer.
- 5.12 The PTEa report, together with the spatial requirements of a new contemporary leisure facility designed to current standards, and the position of the Pools frontage building and Louise House on the site have led officers from the programme management team to conclude that the retention of these buildings and delivery of a high quality modern new facility are not compatible. This is in line with the options appraisal referred to in section 5.9, above.
- 5.13 The three reports detailed in this section formed the basis of the material that was used for consultation and engagement with the local community.

6 Community Engagement and Consultation

6.1 Background

- 6.1.1 In March 2008 the Council's Director of Programme Management & Property set up the delivery arrangements for the first and subsequent phases of work. Given the scale and complexity of the potential options a decision was taken to set up:
- a project board to be responsible for the overall delivery of the project;
 - a project team led by an experienced senior programme manager to undertake the work;
 - the 'Forest Hill stakeholder group', consisting of key stakeholders identified by the project board and verified by the group itself. The role of this group was to provide feedback to the Council on key elements of the programme including the design, and to consider details such as

the retention of any artefacts of historical interest from the current buildings.

Three meetings of the Forest Hill Stakeholder group have been held since March to consider design options and the scope and extent of community consultation.

6.1.2 In June 2008 the project team submitted a consultation plan to the Mayor's Communications and Consultation board (a cross-directorate officer group), which was subsequently approved as the plan for the consultation and community engagement process for the development options for Forest Hill Pools. The main purpose of the consultation was to establish which design options were preferred by which groups of stakeholders and members of the local community, and to explore the preferred balance of housing and leisure provision. The consultation was also designed to capture ideas and preferences for the look and feel of the new building and suggestions for the content of the new leisure centre for the Council to consider as the design progresses.

6.1.3 The methodology and results of the consultation are set out in detail at Appendix A.

6.2 Consultation Summary

6.2.1 From the 18th July to the 8th August officers undertook an extensive and robust consultation exercise in accordance with the programme consultation plan. The methodology and results of this consultation are detailed at Appendix A.

6.2.2 The main findings of the consultation in relation to the redevelopment are:

- the majority of respondents support a 2 pool configuration within the leisure facility;
- the requirement for additional housing to fund additional leisure facilities is understood and accepted by the majority of respondents as long as it is not excessive and is sympathetic to the local area;
- Many useful comments have been received in terms of the design and the type of community facilities required, and these will be taken into account by the programme management team when developing the design;
- The most popular method of reflecting the history of the site in the new design is to integrate historical features of the old building such as the foundation stone. This and other useful comments will be considered by the programme management team when developing the design;
- Although some respondents to the consultation have expressed objections to the demolition of the old buildings, many more have expressed a desire to see a new leisure facility built without further delay.

- 6.2.3 The response of over 600 questionnaires is of sufficient size to hear the broad messages of local people. However, it is clear that views diverge sharply on the retention (or not) of the existing buildings, the design proposed, and the proposals for new housing.
- 6.2.4 There has been some criticism of the timing and publicity of the consultation. For example, as part of the publicity campaign for the consultation (detailed at Appendix A), the Council commissioned a distribution company to post a flyer advertising the exhibition and online survey to households and businesses in the wards of Forest Hill, Sydenham and Perry Vale. From public feedback it would appear that whilst some residents received a flyer, many did not. In line with good practice, the consultation process will be reviewed by the Director of Programme Management and Property, and will be considered by the Mayor's communications and consultation board to establish the lessons to be learned from the process.

7 Louise House – listing

- 7.1 On 20th August 2008 English Heritage wrote to the Council confirming the Grade 2 listing of Louise House. The listing sets out that the building is of both historic and architectural interest and has group value with the library and Holy Trinity School.
- 7.2 Information was provided on the listing to the public meeting held on 21 August 2008 (see Appendix A) and was the subject of lengthy discussion, including questions raised regarding the status of the listing of Louise House and the Council's ability to either challenge the listing or to proceed with demolition.
- 7.3 A decision to list a building is taken solely on grounds of special architectural or historic interest. There is no statutory right of appeal against this decision, at the moment of listing, but an owner may within 28 days of the decision put to the Secretary of State evidence that the building does not possess the architectural or historic interest identified, to demonstrate that the decision was wrongly made. If the Secretary of State accepts that the original assessment of a building's interest was wrong in this way, and that it does not possess special interest, he will then 'de-list' the building. In this case, officers consider the English Heritage advice and research underpinning the listing to be comprehensive and compelling, and this could not be questioned without commissioning historical research.
- 7.4 In order to demolish a listed building, or to alter or extend one in any way that affects its special architectural or historic interest, 'listed building consent' must be obtained from the local planning authority. In this case as the Council is both landowner and Planning Authority, consent would be required from the Secretary of State. Anyone wishing to redevelop a site on which a listed building stands requires both listed building consent for the demolition and planning permission for the new building. Planning permission alone is not sufficient to authorise the

demolition. Similarly, anyone wishing to alter a listed building in a way that would affect its special interest, and whose proposed alteration amounts to development, for which specific planning permission is required, would also need to apply for planning permission and for listed building consent.

- 7.5 The retention of Louise House means that none of the three options that were consulted upon are now deliverable. The original proposals assumed a fully cleared site for redevelopment. A number of respondents to the consultation wanted to see Louise House and the frontage of the pools building retained with new facilities provided behind. Whilst it may be possible to incorporate Louise House and the pool frontage into the new development, this could compromise the layout of the leisure centre, reduce the potential for housing cross-subsidy and would be likely to have an impact on the net cost of the project. The original timetable for the project (planning permission Summer 2009 and completion of the building in early 2011) is now undeliverable.

8 Proposed approach

- 8.1 The key findings of the consultation are set out in paragraph 6.8. These imply a preference for two pools, a wish to ensure any new on-site housing is not excessive and a desire to see a new facility built without further delay. These findings remain relevant irrespective of the listing of Louise House.
- 8.2 However, none of the 3 options consulted upon can be delivered now that Louise House has been listed and it is therefore proposed that the Council reconsiders the approach to the redevelopment of the site. It is proposed to commission feasibility work to examine how a two pool option could be delivered taking into account the listing of Louise House. This further work will include examination of how Louise House and possibly the existing pool frontage could be incorporated into a new scheme for the site. It will also assess the potential for other community uses, the scope for housing cross subsidy, the timetable and the revised costs and risks for each of the options. This would be undertaken as soon as possible and reported to Mayor & Cabinet in early 2009 for consideration.
- 8.3 Officers will investigate the potential for securing funding from the Heritage Lottery Fund as part of any revised project. However, the Council's experience of applying for funding (e.g. for Manor House Library) indicates that it is very difficult to secure and that the timetable for application is often lengthy.
- 8.4 A further report will be submitted to the Mayor detailing the appropriations required for the change of use of land involved in the redevelopment once a final design scheme has been established.

- 8.5 Officers will continue to work with the current Stakeholder Group on all matters relating to the site to ensure that the Council's approach addresses the concerns of as many stakeholders as possible.

9. Financial Implications

- 9.1 The 2008-11 Capital Programme includes gross provision of £9.5m for Forest Hill pool (assuming capital receipts from housing disposal of £2m). This was based on a new build proposal at 2009 prices. At this stage of the project the potential costs of any revised proposals are unknown but it is clear that inflation may have an impact on the budget provided and the potential for housing receipts may be reduced. The cost of any revised scheme will be determined from the subsequent feasibility work now proposed. An initial review of the implications of retaining existing buildings and providing a new two-pool leisure facility indicate a significant funding gap of at least £2m.
- 9.2 The current Capital Programme is very heavily committed and officers are reviewing the level of capital receipts likely to be available across the 3 year programme in the light of the current housing market. In the circumstances, schemes are expected to stay within the budgets set.
- 9.3 The cost of decommissioning the current buildings and the design and consultation work undertaken to date is estimated to be £144k. From this, £94k was spent on feasibility and consultancy costs related to the options that are now not deliverable. These costs are therefore abortive costs and will be written off to the revenue account in 2008/09. This will be funded from property revenue reserves.
- 9.4 The cost of the proposed feasibility work, recommended in this report, is estimated to be £100k.
- 9.5 The current forecast is a funding gap of at least £2m (paragraph 9.1), this means that the project may now be unaffordable. If the project is cancelled at a later date any costs incurred will be abortive costs and will need to be written off to revenue, the total being c£250k.

10. Legal implications

- 10.1 Section 105 of the Housing Act 1985 provides that the Council must consult with all secure tenants who are likely to be substantially affected by a matter of housing management. Section 105 specifies that a matter of housing management includes matters relating to the provision of services or amenities in connection with housing properties. This would therefore include development proposals which impact on communal amenity areas provided to secure tenants. Such consultation must inform secure tenants of the proposals and provide them with an opportunity to make their views known to the Council within a specified period. Section 105 further specifies that before making any decisions on the matter the Council must consider any representations from secure tenants arising from the consultation.

- 10.2 The Section 105 consultation undertaken with secure tenants was in relation to the principle of the inclusion of some or all of the housing amenity land to the front of the Dartmouth Estate within the redevelopment and not on the specific redevelopment options, in respect of which, tenants were encouraged to take part in the mainstream consultation events. The proposed reconsideration of the approach to the redevelopment following the listing of Louise House does not therefore impact on the Section 105 consultation. At this stage, the Mayor is being asked to agree to the principle of some or all of the housing amenity land being included within the redevelopment, whichever final design scheme for the redevelopment is eventually chosen.
- 10.3 A decision on the formal appropriation of any land required for the scheme e.g. from housing to leisure use, will be the subject of a separate report to Mayor and Cabinet at the appropriate time once a final design scheme for the redevelopment has been chosen and the exact extent of the land required is known and, the Council is otherwise in a position to proceed with the redevelopment

11. Equality implications

- 11.1 A new swimming pool would be operated in order to meet the Council's "Active Healthy Citizen Agenda" and would be available to all regardless of gender, race, belief or ability. In particular a new facility would afford the opportunity to build a fully compliant DDA swimming Pool.
- 11.2 The consultation programme was designed to ensure that the widest possible group of stakeholders, including local residents and equalities groups, should have the opportunity to make their views known. Tailored focus groups were held with specific 'seldom heard' groups including young people, Asian elders and disabled people.
- 11.3 An Equalities Impact Assessment of the provision which will be available at Forest Hill Pool will be undertaken at a later stage in the project, to ensure that both the design of the buildings and the leisure provision available meet the needs of the all sections of the community.

12. Environmental implications

- 12.1 A new swimming pool would be designed to meet the latest environmental standards. This would include adherence to Part L regulations and the achievement of a 'very good' BREEAM rating.

13. Crime and disorder implications

- 13.1 Reducing crime and anti-social behaviour would be a key consideration for the design of a new swimming pool. The new development would be 'secure by design', and would improve the street environment of Dartmouth Road.

13.2 The consultation results detailed in Appendix A indicated that many people felt the redevelopment proposals would have had a positive impact on Dartmouth Road in terms of crime prevention and reducing anti-social behaviour.

14 Conclusion

14.1 The consultation process generated over 600 responses to the questionnaire, involved focus group meetings and responses from tenants, local schools and businesses, swimming clubs, local amenity societies and Forest Hill Ward councillors. The response is sufficient to discern the main matters of concern to local people.

14.2 The response indicates that views of local people diverge with support from some for the retention of the current buildings and from others for their demolition. Common themes included a desire for two pools, a limit to on-site housing and a wish to see the centre open as soon as possible. These themes will be included in subsequent thinking.

14.3 The listing of Louise House requires the Council to reconsider the approach agreed in February 2008. It is proposed to undertake further feasibility work to explore the options for the inclusion of Louise House and potentially the pool frontage in a new leisure centre and an examination of the costs and risks associated. It is proposed that these be reported to Mayor & Cabinet in early 2009.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

<u>Short title of document</u>	Date	File Location	Contact Officer
HLM Development Options Study	June 08	www.lewisham.gov.uk/ 2nd Floor, Laurence House, Programme Mgmt Unit	Ron Huntley
PTEa old buildings conversion feasibility study	June 08	www.lewisham.gov.uk/ 2nd Floor, Laurence House, Programme Mgmt Unit	Ron Huntley
Donald Insall Assoc. Historic Buildings Report	June 08	www.lewisham.gov.uk/ 2nd Floor, Laurence House, Programme Mgmt Unit	Ron Huntley
Forest Hill Pools - Outcome of feasibility work and redevelopment options -	February 08	www.lewisham.gov.uk	Ron Huntley

Mayor & Cabinet report			
DCMS Louise House Listing Report	August 08	2nd Floor, Laurence House, Programme Mgmt Unit	Ron Huntley
Forest Hill Public Meeting 21st August 2008 - Minutes	August 08	Cultural Services Building, Bromley Road	Hilary Renwick